Dear Bud,

10/26/75

Appreciate copy Adams/Edwards statement. Could have wept when I read it and recalled what I saw aired and read in papers. Haven't ability to write you at length I'd like because while I can sit up some I can't stand the required leg-spread very long.

Jim told me your belief Schweiker has shifted again. I agree. I wonder whether spontaneously. I'll make no initiate with him now. Yesterday I heard he has Lane in Mississippi after a "witness." Smells like Gaudet, in whom when Lane was getting rich and famous he had no time for work when it could have been relevant to what Garrison was up to. (What wasn't?) I have a notion of what you think of this. There is no point in my contaminating the flag os pea-green and hbile-yellow under which the Quixotes charge with fact and reason. But I do get sick when I think how the opportunity we have had since Watergate is being blown by incompetence and silliness and ignorance and a couple who add sick ambition and self-seeking. And how each of the Members who has been at all willing to try has his face thrust into a manure pile.

If there is a basis for assuming Gaudet knew Oswald or lied as he is represented in the FBI report I am unaware of it. So, he'll be brought to Washington to say he was not on a flight to Mexico with Oswald and what is equally true, that Merida is a right-wing center to which a "red" would never have gone. Gaudet does, as I recall, appear to have gone to Yucatan, Oswald to Mex. Cy, and on different days.

The way this is going almost everything that could be of value in a real, competent investigation will have been irretrievably fucked up before there is a chance of getting one started.

I take this time and write when it is uncomfortable and there are other things I should be doing because I do not equate you/ or what I do think you want with those with whom you associate. Again I would like to save you from yourself and deter your wasting of your seed upon barren ground. In the end you will have become ineffective in the area where you could have been so effective and valuable if not indispensible. I really don't want this to happen to you/us.

I'm sorry you did not give more thought to the speech I prepared for NYU. It was not intended personally with any I addressed, with or without name. It's purpose was to try to get people who are not self-seekers to think and to suggest that without an end to the childishness futility was the future. To this minute it remains correct analysis/prediction.

There are other problems. One is what good will it do if there is still another whitewash? Believe me, I'll be part of none. Here what I am saying is that if any of these juvenilities had worked it would in the end have been counter-productive.

One of the reporters who has a little knowledge of the subject and does listen and sometimes ask last night gave me a description of the Edwards hearing and the row of you and the passing of hasty notes and the futility of it all. It and his description of poor Edwards are pathetic. And I regard it as not less than indecent to do this to a willing man like Edwards. Worse, there is the question of Member/staff minimal competence. If I knew no more than what is in Adams' statement and had the chance to really examine him I could have torn him apart. I do know more, about all the aspects of Adams' statement. While they are not central, Edwards had proper jurisdiction and this could have come out other than to now it has.

All this greasy kid stuff coincides with serious restriction on what I can do. I've been cold much to long to worry about a little more numbness. I am resolute on having this done correctly or not at all. There is nothing I can do to stop all this miserable adventurism but I can preserve myself and perhaps some of my work in it and whether or not in the end this will have meaning this I am determined to do. As I see it, there can be no meaning any other way.

So the pot boils. But who is burned? Is there to be no end to this self-destructiveness?

With sincere regrets,